

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed June 1, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Machida (US Pub. 2002/0115929). The Examiner next rejected claims 10, 12-15, 17, 19, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kimura (USP 6,564,080). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Machida in view of Kimura. Claims 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Machida.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 6, 11 and 18.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of allowed claim 6. As such, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under §102(e).

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 12-15, 17, 19, 20 and 22 stating that Kimura discloses that "the subject being continuously translated through the imaging volume is one-way blood flow, as shown in figure 1." *Office Action, June 1, 2006.* p. 4. Claim 10 calls for a computer programmed to modify application of a preparation RF pulse to account for translation of a subject through an imaging volume. According to the Examiner, Kimura discloses a computer programmed to modify application of a preparation RF pulse to account for translation of one-way blood flow through the imaging volume. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has not identified which, if any, pulses in Kimura may disclose a preparation RF pulse such as that called for in claim 10; however, even if the Examiner was to assert that Kimura teaches a preparation RF pulse, Kimura fails to teach or suggest modifying application of any such pulse to account for translation of one-way blood flow through the imaging volume. That is, Kimura fails to suggest accounting for one-way blood flow translation through the imaging volume and modifying application of a pulse from such accounting.

Additionally, claim 12 calls for the computer to be further programmed to determine a direction of subject translation and apply the offset value to the preparation RF pulse opposite to the direction of subject translation. The Examiner asserted that "[t]he preparation interval is applied in the direction opposite of subject translation." *Id.* However, the Examiner provided no support for this assertion. In fact, Kimura fails to determine a direction of one-way blood flow translation and apply the offset value to the preparation RF pulse opposite to the direction of one-way blood flow translation.

Accordingly, that which is called for in claims 10-16 is not shown, disclosed, taught, or suggested in the art of record. As such, Applicant believes claims 10-16 are patentably distinct over the art of record.

Claim 17 calls for, in part, determination of a distance spins of a magnetization prepared tissue of a patient will travel while the patient is translated through an imaging volume by a moving table during a prescribed preparation interval defined as the time between application of a saturation pulse and commencement of an imaging pulse sequence. The Examiner stated that “[t]he distance spins of the prepared tissue will travel while translated through the imaging volume is determined depending on translation speed, the inversion time, along with other parameters (col 4, lines 23-27).” *Id.* Applicant does not disagree that the distance spins of the prepared tissue will travel while translated through the imaging volume may be, in part, determined depending on translation speed as the Examiner asserted; however, Kimura fails to teach or suggest determination of the distance spins will travel while the patient is translated through an imaging volume by a moving table during a prescribed preparation interval. Kimura does not teach or suggest moving table MRI. As such, Kimura fails to teach or suggest patient translation through an imaging volume by a moving table during a prescribed preparation interval.

Accordingly, that which is called for in claim 17 is not shown, disclosed, taught, or suggested in the art of record. As such, Applicant believes claim 17, and the claims which depend therefrom, are patentably distinct over the art of record.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-5, 7-22.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent L. Baker/

Kent L. Baker  
Registration No. 52,584  
Phone 262-376-5170 ext. 12  
klb@zpspatents.com

Dated: August 1, 2006  
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.175

**P.O. ADDRESS:**

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC  
14135 North Cedarburg Road  
Mequon, WI 53097-1416  
262-376-5170